UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,977	05/14/2001	Scott LeKuch	YOR920000703US3	9087

68168 7590 08/19/2008	EXAMINER
MICHAEL BUCHENHORNER, P.A. 8540 SW 83 STREET SUITE 100 MIAMI, FL 33143	VO, HUYEN X

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/19/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

michael@buchenhorner.com
ana@buchenhorner.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 May 2008</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,2,8-13,18-23 and 28</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,2,8-13,18-23 and 28</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>5/14/2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2.   Claims 1, 11, 21, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitations "wherein said request comprises: an indicator of a requested language; a message to be converted into said requested language, wherein said message is provided in a language other than the requested language; and display attributes for formatting a display of the requested message on the display device", and "wherein individual ones of a plurality of said databases are each associated with a different one of said languages" are not discussed in the original disclosure. Particularly, the specification merely mentions of the term "Request for a Language Element" (*second and third paragraphs on page 4*). There is no indication of a specific "indicator of a requested language" as claimed. It is herein interpreted as data request from the user. The limitation regarding "wherein said message is provided in a language other than the requested language" indicates that the message in a first language is translated into a second language. However, there is no language translation discussed anywhere in the disclosure. There is only a

database containing messages in different languages. It is now interpreted as

conversion of data elements into bitmap data. Furthermore, there is no "display

attributes" being discussed in the disclosure. With respect to claim 28, the disclosure

merely mentions of a plurality of databases, but fails to specifically indicate that each

database is associated with a particular language as claimed. Claim 28 is herein

treated as a plurality of databases.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-2, 8, 10-13, 18, 20-23, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Marmor (US 6601108) in view of Sekiguchi (US 6185604).

5.   Regarding claim 1, Marmor discloses a computing system (*figure 1A-B*),

comprising:

a communication link for bi-directionally providing a communication channel

between a host computing device and a companion computing device (*figures 1A-B,

client device and server are in a bi-directional communication*);

the host computing device for providing multiple language support and user

interface upgrade to the companion device (*col. 1, line 58 to col. 2, line 6, multilingual*

system), wherein said host computing device has access to at least one database in

which a plurality of messages are each stored in a plurality of different languages (*col.*

1, line 58 to col. 2, line 6, multilingual system; accessed through search engine);

the companion computing device, comprising [substantially] less memory

resources than the host computing device, and comprising a display device; a digitizer

input system (*figures 1A-B; client device is well known to have less memory and*

computing resources than the server); and a control device that responds to a user

request for one of said plurality of messages in a first one of said plurality of languages

not supported by said companion device to transmit said request to said host computing

device over said communication link (*figure 3 or col. 10, line 63 to col. 11, line 67; client*

device request for a particular document in a particular language, the server retrieves

and supplies the requested document to the client device);

wherein said request comprises:

an indicator of a requested language (*figure 3 or col. 10, line 63 to col. 11,*

line 67; interpreted as a data request);

display attributes for formatting a display of the requested message on the

display device (*col. 14, lines 1-41, font, size, style, color*);

the at least one database comprising storage sufficient to store and convert the

request (*figures 1A-B, database in the network (Internet) inherently has a lot of*

memory);

wherein said host computing device responds to a receipt of said request for the

requested message by retrieving said message in said requested language from the at

least one database and converting the retrieved message into a representation that

corresponds to the requested message in said requested language (*the operation of*

figures 1A-B; converter converts the document to a format supported by the client

device; or referring to the operation of figure 6, the server retrieves the requested

document and determine if the client device supports said document, and convert the

document into a format supported by client device);

wherein said host computing device transmits to said companion computing

device the bitmap representation of the requested message in the requested language

over said communication link for display on the display device in said requested

language (*figures 1A-B*), wherein the requested message comprises at least multiple

characters of said requested language (*within the scope of the reference, the requested*

document includes multiple characters), wherein the requested message is formatted

for display device (*figures 1A-B, converter does this*).

Marmor fails to specifically disclose a message to be converted into said

requested language, where said message is provided in a language other than the

requested language, and wherein said companion computing device, without

conversion from character codes to graphic elements, stores and presents the bitmap

representation as a full screen image of the requested message on said display device.

However, Sekiguchi teaches that a message to be converted into said requested

language, where said message is provided in a language other than the requested

language (*abstract section; converting email document to image data or bitmap data; interpreted as conversion of data elements into bitmap data*), and wherein said companion computing device, without conversion from character codes to graphic elements, stores and presents the bitmap representation as a full screen image of the requested message on said display device (*abstract section; converting email document to image data or bitmap data*).

Since Marmor and Sekiguchi are analogous arts because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Marmor by incorporating the teaching of Sekiguchi in order to enable devices of small processing power to access data of different languages.

6.   Regarding claim 11, Marmor discloses a method of providing language element support to a companion computing device from a host computing device, said method comprising the steps of:

receiving from said companion computing device a request from a user of the companion computing device for a first message in a first language not initially supported by said companion device, wherein said request was initiated by the user implementing a digitizer input system of the companion computing device (*figure 3 or col. 10, line 63 to col. 11, line 67; client device request for a particular document in a particular language, the server retrieves and supplies the requested document to the client device; all computing devices include a digitizer in order to convert real word signal into computer data*), and wherein the request comprises:

an indicator of the first language (*figure 3 or col. 10, line 63 to col. 11, line 67;*

interpreted as a data request);

display attributes for formatting the first message for display on the companion

device (*col. 14, lines 1-41, font, size, style, color*);

wherein said second message is one of a plurality of messages stored in at least

one database in a plurality of languages that includes said first language, wherein said

host computing device has access to said at least one database (*col. 1, line 58 to col. 2,*

line 6, multilingual system; accessed through search engine);

retrieving said first message in said first language from said database in

response to said receipt of said request, converting the first message into a

representation (*the operation of figures 1A-B; converter converts the document to a*

format supported by the client device; or referring to the operation of figure 6, the server

retrieves the requested document and determine if the client device supports said

document, and convert the document into a format supported by client device);

transmitting to said companion computing device the bitmap representation of

the first message for presentation on a display device of said companion computing

device in said first language (*figures 1A-B*), wherein the first message comprises at

least multiple characters of said first language (*within the scope of the reference, the*

requested document includes multiple characters), wherein the first message is

formatted for said display device (*figures 1A-B, converter does this*).

Marmor fails to specifically disclose a message to be converted into said

requested language, where said message is provided in a language other than the

requested language, and such that said companion computing device, without

conversion from character codes to graphic elements, is able to present the bitmap

representation as a full screen image of the first message on said display device.

However, Sekiguchi teaches that a message to be converted into said requested

language, where said message is provided in a language other than the requested

language (*abstract section; converting email document to image data or bitmap data;*

interpreted as conversion of data elements into bitmap data), such that said companion

computing device, without conversion from character codes to graphic elements, is able

to present the bitmap representation as a full screen image of the first message on said

display device (*abstract section; converting email document to image data or bitmap*

data).

Since Marmor and Sekiguchi are analogous arts because they are from the same

field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of invention to modify Marmor by incorporating the teaching of Sekiguchi in order to

enable devices of small processing power to access data of different languages.

7.   Regarding claim 21, Marmor discloses a storage medium having computer

readable program instructions embodied therein (*client/server computing architecture*

inherently includes storage memory), said program instructions enabling a computer to:

        transmit from a companion computing device to a host computing device a

request of a user for a first message in a first language not initially supported by said

companion device, wherein said request was initiated by the user implementing a

digitizer input system of the companion computing device (*figure 3 or col. 10, line 63 to col. 11, line 67; client device request for a particular document in a particular language, the server retrieves and supplies the requested document to the client device; all computing devices include a digitizer in order to convert real word signal into computer data*), and wherein the request comprises:

an indicator of the first language (*figure 3 or col. 10, line 63 to col. 11, line 67; interpreted as a data request*);

display attributes for formatting the first message for display on the companion device (*col. 14, lines 1-41, font, size, style, color*);

wherein said second message is one of a plurality of messages stored in at least one database in a plurality of languages that includes said first language, wherein said host computing device has access to said at least one database (*col. 1, line 58 to col. 2, line 6, multilingual system; accessed through search engine*).

receive from the host computing device the representation of the requested message for presentation on a display device of said companion computing device in said first language (*figures 1A-B*), wherein the first message comprises at least multiple characters of said first language (*within the scope of the reference, the requested document includes multiple characters*), wherein the first message is formatted for said display device (*figures 1A-B, converter does this*).

Marmor fails to specifically disclose a message to be converted into said requested language, where said message is provided in a language other than the requested language, and display the bitmap representation as a full screen image on

the display device without conversion from character codes to graphic elements.

However, Sekiguchi teaches that a message to be converted into said requested

language, where said message is provided in a language other than the requested

language (*abstract section; converting email document to image data or bitmap data;

interpreted as conversion of data elements into bitmap data*), and display the bitmap

representation as a full screen image on the display device without conversion from

character codes to graphic elements (*abstract section; converting email document to

image data or bitmap data*).

Since Marmor and Sekiguchi are analogous arts because they are from the same

field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of invention to modify Marmor by incorporating the teaching of Sekiguchi in order to

enable devices of small processing power to access data of different languages.

8.   Regarding claims 2, 12-13, and 22, Mamor further discloses wherein said

complete message further comprises a character set of graphic icons (*figure 2, HTML

document includes character set including characters of icons*), wherein individual ones

of a plurality of said databases are each associated with a specific language (*figure 4,

different languages*).

9.   Regarding claims 8, 18, and 23, Marmor fails to specifically disclose that the

companion computing device stores the image representation transmitted from said

host computing device for later use. However, Sekiguchi teaches that the companion

computing device stores the image representation transmitted from said host computing

device for later use (*col. 15, lines 19-24, can be a PC for storing the image data*).

Since Marmor and Sekiguchi are analogous arts because they are from the same

field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of invention to modify Marmor by incorporating the teaching of Sekiguchi in order to

enable user to view the requested document in a later time.

10.   Regarding claims 10 and 20, Mamor further discloses that the communication

link is a wired or wireless (*within the scope of the reference*).

11.   Regarding claim 28, Marmor further discloses the computing system of claim 1,

wherein individual ones of a plurality of said databases are each associated with a

different one of said languages (*col. 1, lines 58 to col. 2, line 6; multilingual databases*).

12.   Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Marmor (US 66601108) in view of Sekiguchi (US 6185604), and further in view of

Official Notice.

13.   Regarding claims 9 and 19, Mamor fails to specifically disclose the digitizer input

system comprises an electronic pen or stylus for handwritten information. However,

examiner takes the official notice that it is extremely well known that a typical PDA

comprises an electronic pen/stylus for the input of handwritten information. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify Marmor to use a PDA with a styluses/electronic pens in order to provide

users with convenient access to data.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to HUYEN X. VO whose telephone number is (571)272-

7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Huyen X Vo/   8/13/2008
Examiner, Art Unit 2626

***